DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 261 FL 020 031

AUTHOR Hamayan, Else V.
TITLE Preparing Mainstream Classroom Teachers To Teach Potentially English Proficient Students.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 90
NOTE 23p.; In: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues (1st, Washington, DC, September 10-12, 1990); see FL 020 030.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; *Limited English Speaking; Mainstreaming; *Second Language Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

In view of the growing numbers of Potentially English Proficient (PEP) students (students whose first language is other than English, who are from different cultural and/or ethnic backgrounds, and who have the potential for becoming English proficient), it is suggested that the preparation of mainstream teachers on issues of PEP education should be a priority of local and state education agencies. A staff development program is proposed that would be aimed at mainstream teachers with PEP students already in their classrooms. The program would include four major knowledge areas: second language learning, bilingualism, integrated content English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction, and grouping practices. It is concluded that this training for teachers has at least two benefits: the students will achieve in both language and content areas, and the training will ensure that collaboration be created between the mainstream teachers and their bilingual or ESL counterparts. Contains 40 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PREPARING MAINSTREAM CLASSROOM TEACHERS TO TEACH POTENTIALLY ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Else V. Hamayan

ED341261

INTRODUCTION

The number of students with a primary language other than English who are in need of specialized instructional services is on the rise. Because of the large wave of immigration to the United States currently in progress, potentially English proficient (PEP) students continue to enroll in schools throughout the country (Watson, Northcutt and Rydell, 1989). The types of services provided to these students vary greatly and are dependent on several factors, including both the size of the linguistically diverse population in their area and the resources available locally. Some PEP students are enrolled in transitional bilingual programs and receive part of their education through the native language, while others simply receive instruction in English as a second language (ESL). Some students receive instructional support through other categorical programs, such as the federally funded Chapter I program, vocational programs, and migrant education.

The needs of a significant percentage of PEP students, however, remain unmet (CCSSO,1989). Students are either not given any extra support by the local school district, for example, or they are inappropriately served in programs such as special education. A recent survey conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers indicated that at least 25 percent of PEP students remain unserved by local school districts in nineteen of thirty-three states that had a discrepancy between the number of PEP students identified and the number served (CCSSO, 1989).

Regardless of the type of program in which PEP students participate, or whether they receive any supplementary instructional support at all, a constant factor in the education of PEP students is the instruction they receive in mainstream classrooms. Even students who are in full-fledged bilingual programs spend part of their school day in a mainstream classroom; students who are not receiving any specialized instructional services, on the other hand, spend their entire school day in the mainstream classroom.

Because of the growing number of youngsters who qualify as PEP students and because of their increased presence in the mainstream, preparing classroom teachers to work with PEP students warrants serious consideration.

FL 020 031

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper is based on the notion that mainstream classroom teachers have an essential role to play in the education of PEP students. The preparation of these teachers for the assumption of the various roles that they may play in relation to their PEP students is the central theme of this paper. The preparation of teachers before service begins is discussed briefly; the major emphasis of the paper, however, is on the preparation of teachers at the inservice level. The emphasis on inservice training over preservice training is not because preparing teachers for specialized instruction prior to their employment is seen as undesirable but rather because of the nature of teacher training in general. It is doubtful that most teacher training institutions would be willing (nor would it be feasible for them) to offer coursework on a regular basis that would focus on the instruction of PEP students. After all, not all teachers in training will have PEP students in their classrooms. Therefore, this paper is addressed to teachers who find themselves in schools with a linguistically diverse student population. More specifically, the issues discussed in this paper are particularly pertinent to teachers who have not had extensive training in the education of PEP students.

THE ROLE OF THE MAINSTREAM CLASSROOM TEACHER VIS-A-VIS PEP STUDENTS

Regardless of the amount of time that a mainstream teacher spends with PEP students, he or she plays an important role in those students' educational development. Mainstream classroom teachers can have five major functions in the education of PEP students. Some of these functions emerge through daily contact with the students in the classroom and concern actual instruction. Others result from students' exposure to teachers in the larger school setting and may affect students' general linguistic, academic, social, and cultural development.

The first role that a mainstream classroom teacher can play vis-a-vis PEP students is that of a mediator and facilitator of learning. This notion of mediation is discussed by Feuerstein; the teacher is seen as a mediating agent who interposes him or herself "between the child and external sources of stimulation, and 'mediates' the world to the child by framing, selecting, focusing, and feeding back environmental experiences in such a way as to produce in him appropriate learning sets and habits" (Feuerstein, 1982, p.71). By virtue of their limited proficiency in the language of instruction, PEP students cannot optimally benefit from content area classes (e.g., math and science,) taught entirely in English. PEP students do not have the language proficiency necessary to meet the linguistic demands of content area classes. They may lack the ability to reason in English, and they are likely to have difficulty learning new vocabulary in English related to new content area concepts. Since both of these cognitive processes are in continual demand in the

content area classroom (Chamot and O'Malley, 1986), some type of mediation is necessary.

The most direct way of mediating content area instruction for PEP students would be through their native language, but that is not always a feasible option, especially for a monolingual English-speaking mainstream classroom teacher. Other, albeit less desirable, options are available through the medium of English: teachers can help the PEP students in their classrooms gain access to instruction by specifically preparing them for content area lessons prior to introducing new concepts and by modifying their own teaching slightly (see Hamayan and Perlman, 1990, for practical suggestions). They can also help create a support system for the PEP students by setting up a peer tutoring arrangement in which PEP students are tutored by an English proficient peer or by simply pairing them up with buddies in the classroom who guide them through content area lessons as they unfold.

The second role that a mainstream classroom teacher can play in the education of PEP students is that of a person who facilitates the acquisition of English as a second language, especially the cognitively-demanding academic type of language that is used in content area classes. Essentially, any interaction between an ESL learner and a native speaker of English is an opportunity for the student to learn in the second language. Whether in the classroom, the playground, or the school hallway, the teacher provides the student with valuable information about the new language as well as feedback regarding the student's own language. In the classroom, the teacher can foster the development of forms and language proficiency related to literacy, particularly in the content areas. This type of language proficiency has been referred to as Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Cummins, 1980) and is essential in succeeding in an academic setting.

Classroom language has other beneficial effects: interactions between the teacher and the entire group of students have instructional value for the PEP students in that class. The students learn from listening to the teacher talk and to other students respond. Classroom interaction can have especially great value to PEP students if it is structured in such a way that students know what to expect both in terms of the content area being taught and the language that accompanies it (Simich-Dudgeon, McCreedy, and Schleppegrell, 1989). It is also important for PEP students to learn the language that accompanies classroom routines so that they may become fully functioning participants in the classroom.

Outside the classroom, a third role emerges for the teacher, that of the proficient English language user. As a proficient speaker of English, the teacher can provide a valuable model for PEP students that they may not get from their peers. Teachers can also provide students with valuable feedback regarding

their language that they are also not likely to get from their peers. As feedback that PEP students receive from their English proficient peers may be rather critical and harsh, the teacher's contributions are helpful and timely. Outside the classroom, interactions between mainstream teachers and PEP students usually focus on the message rather than the form of language, making the situation more conducive to the development of communicative skills used in informal interpersonal relations (referred to as the Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills by Cummins, 1980.)

Teachers need to provide students with feedback about their language, but they need to do so indirectly and implicitly, avoiding the mere correction and replacement of the student's utterances. One useful method is to expand and extend what the student says. For example, if the student says: "I think so he no come to school today," the teacher might respond: "Oh, you think he didn't come to school today? Do you know why?" rather than focusing on the erroneous structures in the student's utterance. This gives the student the correct linguistic model and, as an important corollary, sends the message that the student's attempts at communication are accepted. (See Simich-Dudgeon, McCreedy, and Schleppegrell, 1989, for some useful guidelines for teachers in helping PEP students to communicate.)

The fourth role for the mainstream classroom teacher is that of a representative of the mainstream culture and a mediating agent in the socialization and acculturation of the student into the mainstream school community. In the case of students who come from a cultural background that is vastly different from that of the mainstream population, there is a need for developing and maintaining the social and cultural bridges between the students' home culture and that of the school (Ovando, 1989). Teachers can help PEP students who come from a cultural background that is different from that of the school by making the norms of the school culture as explicit as possible, but in a nonthreatening way. Students need time to learn about a new culture and will need even more time to adopt its norms. Also the adoption of a new culture does not need to occur at the expense of the native culture. Students need to feel proud of their own heritage to be motivated to learn and to be proud of their new second culture (Simich-Dudgeon, McCreedy, and Schleppegrell, 1989).

The mediation between cultures, that of the mainstream population and that of the linguistically diverse student populations, must be multidirectional. That is, members of the mainstream can also benefit from learning about the various cultures that PEP students represent. Teachers can play an extremely valuable role in creating a truly multicultural environment in their school by giving a prominent place to PEP students' culture in everyday school life. This means going beyond the annual multicultural food festival, or the occasional lesson about piñatas. Creating a truly multicultural school milieu implies viewing every aspect of the curriculum from the perspective of other

cultures. By doing so, PEP students, who are typically perceived as being in need of remediation, gain significant status as valuable resources.

A final and vital role for mainstream classroom teachers to play in the education of PEP students is that of an advocate. An advocacy-oriented attitude is essential in counteracting the potentially disabling process that many PEP students face in school (Damico and Hamayan, 1990). Some researchers argue that programs for linguistically diverse students have been less than successful because they generally have not significantly altered the relationship between educators and minority students and between schools and linguistically diverse communities (Cummins, 1986). Sociological analyses of schools (Ogbu, 1978; Paulston, 1980) suggest that students from "dominated" societal groups are either empowered or disabled as a direct result of how the school incorporates the students' language and culture; how the participation of the linguistically diverse community is encouraged; and how teachers and administrators become advocates for PEP students and begin to focus on their assets rather than their problems.

In the face of a disabling attitude which considers PEP students disadvantaged, with little esteem attached to their actual or potential bilingualism, students can experience a loss of control over their lives. This disabling attitude is exhibited in the label "limited English proficient" — the official and legal name for students with a primary language other than English whose proficiency in English has not reached a high enough level to allow them to survive in a classroom where English is the medium of instruction. This label focuses on the negative aspect of not being proficient in English rather than stressing the positive aspect of adding one language on to another and becoming bilingual. When faced with this type of negativism, students lose confidence in their cultural and linguistic identity as well as in their ability to learn, and this lack of confidence may have devastating effects on their academic life (Ovando, 1989). Advocacy is not a political stance as much as it is an outlook of professionals who work in the best interest of their clients — in this case, the students.

In addition to the five functions described in the preceding sections that pertain directly to PEP students, mainstream classroom teachers also play two indirect roles by collaborating and consulting with other teachers in the school. All teachers who come into contact with PEP students can provide to one another as well as to school administrators valuable information about the students in their classes. They can also share with one another information about their content area specializations.

The first of these two additional roles is that mainstream classroom teachers are a valuable source of information about a student's performance in the mainstream classroom. In many schools, the education of each student is

in the hands of several teachers who do not often get a chance to talk to one another about individual students. Thus, the global picture of each student exists only on paper and remains fragmented and narrow in scope. It is important to make that picture as whole and as informative as possible by having all teachers who come into contact with a PEP student contribute information about that student.

Two issues are critical here: the information needs to come from multiple sources, that is, from as many teachers as possible; and it needs to be as understandable and as self-evident as possible. The need for multiple sources of information arises from the fact that a student's performance may vary significantly from class to class and from teacher to teacher. This call for understandable and self-evident data arises from the widespread, exclusive use of discrete-point and norm-referenced testing in schools. Data obtained from norm-referenced tests are often not sufficient by themselves to make informed decisions about instruction or placement.

A multiple-referenced approach to assessment (see Davidson, Hudson, and Lynch, 1985), which includes informal indices of behavior and performance in addition to the traditional norm-referenced testing is imperative. Teachers' judgments regarding students' ability to process and to use content specific language functions, as well as judgments concerning their general performance in class can yield valuable information for those who make placement decisions as well as for other teachers who have those students in their classrooms (see Hamayan and Perlman, 1990, for suggestions).

The second role concerns the mainstream classroom teachers' wealth of experience in teaching the various content areas in which they specialize. These teachers can well share those strategies and techniques, as well as the content of their instruction, with ESL teachers who have those students in their ESL classes. Despite research findings indicating the importance of integrating the instruction of ESL with content area subjects (Crandall, et al., 1988; Mohan, 1986), the focus of ESL classes in many schools remains independent of academic content areas. ESL teachers often teach their classes with little regard for the content area curriculum and only a vague idea as to how that curriculum is affecting their students. Mainstream classroom teachers can help ESL teachers incorporate content area topics into their ESL lessons by sharing with them their curriculum and key chapters from the textbooks they are using. In turn, ESL teachers can share their teaching strategies, specially designed for learning a second language, with the content area teachers. Teacher partnerships, discussed in a later section of this paper, are extremely beneficial for both ESL and mainstream classroom teachers.

Preparing for these roles is a challenging task for both the teachers themselves and the institutions of teacher education and training. Issues

regarding the preparation of teachers at the preservice stage are discussed in the following section.

PREPARING FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF PEP STUDENTS AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Preparing teachers for the education of PEP students is a difficult task even in the case of those who eventually end up as bilingual or ESL teachers. A recent survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (McMillen, 1990) indicated that only 35 percent of bilingual and ESL teachers during the 1987-88 school year both majored and were certified in the field they taught. An additional 56 percent of the teachers did not major in either of the two fields but were certified in one of them; and about 7 percent of the teachers had neither majored nor were certified in their field.

It is not likely that teachers who are specializing in fields other than bilingual or ESL education are receiving much substantive training in the instruction of PEP students. An informal examination of material published by the leading organizations for staff development yields very little on the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students (see for example, Caldwell, 1989, and Joyce, 1990). A national survey (O'Malley, 1983) estimated that half of all public school teachers in the United States in 1980 either had PEP students in their classes or had taught them previously; yet only one teacher in seventeen had taken any courses in techniques for teaching ESL.

Therefore, there is reason for concern that teacher education programs are not meeting the needs of a large sector of students. In a recent initiative, led by the Carnegie Foundation, thirty institutions were asked to redesign their curricula based on the answers to five questions. Two of those questions dealt with linguistic and cultural diversity: how could the curriculum be made more accurate regarding different cultural, international, and gender perspectives? and what could be done to alleviate the shortage of minority teachers?

One option is to redesign the curriculum of teacher preparation programs to include at least one course that deals with the education of linguistically diverse students. This course would cover discussions of second language acquisition theory, definitions of bilingualism, sheltered content area instruction, and multicultural education. In addition to a course dedicated to language minority issues, redesigning the curriculum of a teacher preparation program to meet the needs of PEP students better would also entail adjusting all the core courses that constitute the program to address — even if briefly — issues of language minority education. For example, a course on reading in the secondary school curriculum would refer to special considerations for students who come from linguistically or culturally diverse backgrounds. Thus, teachers in training would not only focus on these issues in a special course but would

have the opportunity to reflect on how to handle linguistically or culturally diverse students within the framework of mainstream education. Of course, such changes are only feasible and reasonable in programs which prepare teachers for urban and suburban schools, where there are concentrations of language minority students.

In lieu of focusing on the education of linguistically diverse students directly, however, teacher training programs in general would benefit greatly from a current trend evidenced in second language teacher education. In teacher training programs in which some consideration is given to the education of linguistically and culturally diverse student populations, there seems to be a shift in orientation from teacher training to teacher education (Richards and Nunan, 1990). This shift allows teachers to be actively involved in developing their own theories of teaching, in understanding the nature of teacher decision making, and in developing strategies for critical self-awareness and self-evaluation. These skills are generally and widely applicable in that they need not be specific to second language education, but rather they are skills that would enhance any type of teaching — or, indeed, any type of professional development (Schon, 1987).

Another way in which institutions of higher education can contribute to the preparation of teachers for the education of PEP students is by providing teachers with specialty certification or teacher approval. Because of the significant demand for bilingual and ESL teachers in urban and suburban districts, many mainstream classroom teachers are returning to universities to obtain additional certification or approval to become specialists in language minority education. In many states, certification or approval is needed by teachers who spend a significant amount of their time with PEP students. At present, thirty-three states and the District of Columbia have certification or endorsement and two states have pending certification legislation for ESL (Kreidler, 1987).

Specialization in ESL is necessary because being a fluent speaker of English does not ensure that a teacher is academically prepared or qualified to teach nonnative speakers (Kreidler, 1986). There are many differences between teaching English to those who already speak it well and teaching it to nonnative speakers. Similarly, there are vast differences between teaching science or geography in English to those who are fluent in English and teaching those subjects to students who are not proficient in English. In addition, certification for bilingual instruction is necessary primarily to ensure that the teacher is proficient in the language of instruction.

- Minimum standards for certification, approval, or endorsement are set by each state individually. Generally, they include coursework in the study of linguistics as well as the pedagogy of teaching English as a second language. The

state of Illinois has recently established and revised its requirements for ESL and bilingual teacher approval, and it may be helpful to describe these requirements briefly as an example. As of September 1985, in order to teach ESL, teachers who already have an elementary or secondary teaching certificate must show evidence of having taken eighteen credit hours in the following areas: theoretical foundations in language minority education, assessment of language minority students, methods and materials to teach English as a second language, crosscultural education, and linguistics. Teachers must, in addition, show evidence of 100 clock hours of clinical work with students who are learning English as a second language. Requirements for teachers who are applying for an approval for bilingual education are similar: eighteen credit hours are needed in the first four areas listed for ESL approval and a course in methods and materials to teach bilingual students instead of linguistics. In addition, bilingual teachers have to fulfill language requirements for the language in which they are approved to teach.

Although requirements such as these are quite extensive and encompass the major areas involved in teaching PEP students, they tend to fall short on two accounts. First, there is a marked absence of coursework on the development of literacy in English as a second language, a crucial factor in PEP students' success in school. Teachers, especially those specializing in ESL, need to make the development of literacy in English a continuing goal and an integral component of the entire curriculum. Second, the requirements tend to maintain an artificial separation of language and content. In the case of ESL certification, the absence of coursework on the instruction of content area subjects to students who are not proficient in the language of instruction may lead to a lack of integration between the instruction in language and that in academic content. As a result, teachers who perceive themselves primarily as ESL teachers may not see the instruction of academic content areas as their domain.

Certification may meet the needs of the small proportion of mainstream classroom teachers who wish to specialize in either ESL or bilingual instruction. Yet the majority of mainstream classroom teachers who come into contact with PEP students are simply that: they are teachers whose classrooms include primarily English proficient students from the mainstream along with a few students who are learning English as a second language. For those teachers, inservice assistance is likely to be a more effective staff development approach.

HELPING MAINSTREAM TEACHERS THROUGH STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development has recently received much attention as a crucial factor in creating an effective school environment (Caldwell, 1989). Research

indicates that significant school improvement results from staff development and that staff development is an important corollary to change in the culture of a school (Goodlad, 1987). Effecting change in school personnel leads to such improvements as increases in student achievement, improvement in attitudes, and growth in skills. As the linguistic and ethnic makeup of student populations increases in diversity, the need becomes urgent for high quality staff development, which promotes an understanding among teachers and administrators of issues in the education of PEP students.

Some general assumptions and research findings regarding effective staff development practices (Caldwell, 1989) will help establish a framework for training teachers who have PEP students in their classrooms. First, a successful staff development program involves and benefits everyone who influences students' learning. This development is especially germane to mainstream classroom teachers who have PEP students in their classrooms. For a long time, the mainstream has perceived the education of PEP students to be the sole responsibility of specialized teachers such as the ESL or bilingual teacher. Positive leadership from mainstream classroom teachers has been shown, however, to be a crucial factor in effective programs for PEP students (Carter and Chatfield, 1986). In as much as the education of PEP students is an integral part of a school's goals and objectives and in as much as the specialized strategies which are known to be effective for PEP students are also effective for the general student population, staff development focused on the education of PEP students and offered to mainstream teachers is vital for any school that has even a few PEP students.

Second, individual teachers and schools engaged in successful staff development programs have the inherent responsibility to define and achieve their own excellence (Caldwell, 1989). Research on effective schools (Edmonds, 1979) indicates that one of the characteristics of successful schools is the autonomy which the school leadership and staff possess in determining the exact means by which they address the challenge of increasing student academic performance. The belief that the responsibility for excellence rests at the school site and within the classroom has strong implications for how staff development is planned, conducted, and evaluated. Teachers need to take an active part in all phases of staff development, including implementation. A model of staff development which incorporates the idea of teachers coaching teachers is suggested in a later section of this paper.

A Framework for Analyzing Staff Development: Context

Staff development can be considered to consist of three organizing components: context, content, and process (Sparks, 1983). Context is the environment in which staff development takes place; it concerns the "why" and "where." The "why" refers to the perceived need for staff development in

the area of PEP student instruction. Although this need may fall within larger district goals or initiatives and although the mission of the larger district sets the stage for the staff development program at the local school level, it is important that the need be perceived locally and that any staff development be planned to address that need directly at the local school level. The "where" refers to the location and the locus of control of the staff development activity, for example, the department, the school, or the district itself.

Many contextual factors contribute to the effectiveness of a staff development program; for example, a district's policies regarding staff release time or funds for substitute teachers, or resource allocations for various types of staff development needs which demonstrate commitment to long-term growth in a specific area (Caldwell, 1989). The education of PEP students has typically not been a high priority item in many districts' staff development plans although with the growing presence of linguistically diverse students in schools, it is becoming more of an urgent need for many school administrators and teachers.

The Content of Staff Development for the Education of PEP Students

The second organizing component of a staff development plan is content. The content of any professional growth activity should be based on research and validated in practice (Caldwell, 1989). The last decade has witnessed an abundance of research on second language learning and teaching, resulting in a multitude of classroom strategies and practices. Four major areas are relevant to mainstream classroom teachers with PEP students: second language acquisition, bilingualism, sheltering instruction, and grouping of students. These are reviewed in the following sections.

Second Language Learning

Unlike first language acquisition, learning a second language is often fraught with difficulty. Beginning learners constantly make errors in producing and comprehending the second language, and they invariably have difficulty processing information presented in that language. Even under the best of circumstances, this state of apparent "incompetence" may last as long as six years (Cummins, 1980). In addition, many who attempt to learn a second language are unable to do so. Students differ considerably regarding the ease with which they are able to attain proficiency in a second language, and many individual learner characteristics underlie success in learning a second language. Among these characteristics are cognitive factors such as learning and perceptual styles (Tucker, Hamayan and Genesee, 1976; for a review of the minor role that intelligence plays, see Genesee, 1976); affective and personality factors such as attitudes, motivation, and personality traits (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Tucker, Hamayan and Genesee, 1976); and, most important, the

student's proficiency in the first language, such that a threshold level of proficiency is necessary in order for second language learning to occur optimally (Cummins, 1980).

Awareness of these aspects of second language learning will shape a mainstream classroom teacher's expectations of a PEP student. Many teachers do not realize just how long it takes for a student to become proficient enough in English to survive in a classroom where English is the language of instruction. Preliminary research suggests that it may take from four to eight years for PEP students to reach national grade-level norms of native speakers in language and academic subject areas (Collier, 1987). A teacher who is not aware of the length of time it takes a PEP student to become proficient in English may have higher expectations of that student than are warranted and may put more pressure to perform than is necessary on that student. This is not only likely to raise the student's anxiety, but it also turns the context from one in which students' achievements are emphasized to one in which students' failures are highlighted.

Another aspect of the process of second language learning which is important for mainstream classroom teachers to understand involves the treatment of errors that second language learners make. When a second language emerges naturally, errors are likely to occur and are a necessary part of the language learning process. As PEP students attempt to communicate in English, their language production reflects an internal language system which consists of a hybrid of differing language systems. This interlanguage (Selinker, 1972) results in the production of English that is not like the English of native speakers but only approximates it. The development of this interlanguage, however, is a normal and systematically predictable stage of acquisition and not a case of poor or impaired English language learning.

The expectation that many mainstream classroom teachers have for PEP students to produce near perfect sentences in English as a second language is far from realistic. Rather than try to stop PEP students from making errors in English, teachers can actually make use of the valuable information that errors in the second language represent. Errors are clues to the language learning processes and language use strategies applied by the student and can be used to provide the student with a better linguistic environment.

Bilingualism

The second major area of which mainstream classroom teachers need to develop an awareness involves the definition and types of bilingualism, including an understanding of language proficiency. Language proficiency is a complex, multi-faceted, multi-leveled and variable phenomenon. Mainstream classroom teachers need to be particularly aware of the independence of two types of language proficiency — the basic interpersonal communication skills

and a more abstract cognitive academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1980). Many PEP students in mainstream classrooms may have attained the social skills in English and may on the surface appear to be proficient; however, if their proficiency in the more cognitively demanding skills which are so crucial for success in an academic setting is not adequate, they are likely to encounter difficulties in content area classes.

This complexity makes discussions of bilingualism equally complex since the measure of a speaker's language proficiency in each language is the defining factor in describing that individual's bilingualism. Because of this complexity and because only some people who attempt to learn a second language actually become highly proficient in it, the term "bilingualism" typically refers to different levels of proficiency in the two languages involved. Different types of bilingualism are possible. One type of bilingualism is exemplified by the learner who has attained an equal level of proficiency in more than one language, referred to as "balanced bilingualism." This type of bilingualism is the exception rather than the rule because it is more likely for bilinguals to have one dominant language, that is, to have a higher level of proficiency in one language or, more specifically, in some aspects of one language. Mainstream classroom teachers' expectations of PEP students in the content areas can be affected and even defined by their knowledge of bilingual proficiency.

The attainment of proficiency in two languages also manifests itself in different ways. When a second language is learned after the speaker has acquired the first, two types of bilingualism may occur — "additive" or "subtractive" (Lambert, 1977). In additive bilingualism, learners who have attained the expected level of proficiency in their first language simply add on a second language to their existing repertoire in the first language. In contrast, in subtractive bilingualism, the development of proficiency in the second language has inhibiting and sometimes detrimental effects on the first language. Subtractive bilingualism may even result in skills that are below expected levels of proficiency in both languages, especially in academic areas — a state that some researchers refer to as "semilingualism."

To ensure that semilingualism, which has detrimental effects on a student's emotional, cognitive, linguistic and academic development (Paulston, 1980) does not occur, schools must promote additive forms of bilingualism, and the burden of responsibility rests with mainstream classroom teachers and administrators. The educational strategy that best overcomes subtractive bilingualism and the resulting semilingualism is that of valuing and allowing the development of the students' native languages (Cummins, 1986).

A factor which underlies the success or failure of a school in preventing subtractive bilingualism is the attitude that prevails in the school not only

toward PEP students but also toward bilingualism and toward the various native languages that coexist in that community. Teachers' attitudes toward students have been clearly shown to be a strong predictor of student success (Rosenthall and Jacobson, 1989). Teachers' ability to see the potential in PEP students, rather than their limitations, is bound to be a crucial factor in students' academic success. The value that is placed on being bilingual and having access to two languages helps set a tone for the entire school milieu that promotes achievement for all students and not only for those who belong to the mainstream population.

Many programs for PEP students tend to isolate and to label students, both restricting the range of instruction and slowing its pace (Perlman, 1990). In addition, they tend to suppress the student's native language, often with the excuse that it is not feasible to teach the various native languages because of lack of resources. School culture research suggests, however, a more ecological understanding of how students with a primary language other than English learn. For example, the native language has more than just an instructional role. Its use confers status and suggests value and power. When the student's native language is placed in high esteem, the student's own self-esteem is bound to improve. Parents are also more likely to become involved in their children's education if the use of the native language is valued, especially by the mainstream teaching staff. Parents can then take a collaborative role with the school not an exclusionary one.

Thus, mainstream classroom teachers need to develop an awareness of how a second language is learned and of the different types of bilingualism that may result, so that their expectations of PEP students' performance are realistic. Their attitudes toward bilingualism and their openness to other cultures are crucial in setting up students for success rather than failure in school.

Sheltering Instruction

The third domain in which mainstream classroom teachers need to develop their skills concerns actual teaching strategies and approaches. Sheltering instruction refers to an adaptive teaching strategy to present content area material to PEP students through a variety of established ESL techniques to make the material more meaningful. The technique of presentation, not the content, differs from that of regular instruction. Sheltered instruction techniques include frequently using illustrations and manipulatives, drawing students' attention to key words in the text, relating new material to students' experiences, making hands-on activities rather than the teacher the center of the classroom, and employing cooperative learning techniques (see Hamayan and Perlman, 1990 for practical suggestions for modifying and sheltering instruction).

The impetus for using sheltered instruction techniques results from the difficulty that PEP students encounter in the mainstream classroom in processing abstract, cognitively demanding information in English. By means of sheltered instruction, abstract content area material is taught through context-rich language, through active participation, and by building on students' own experiences. When teachers make an effort to modify their instruction in this way, they become conscious of the fact that PEP students are developing their language at the same time as they are developing concepts (Parker, 1985). This integration of language and content allows for a more efficient development of the second language. It also changes the way that both ESL and mainstream classroom teachers perceive themselves and their roles vis-a-vis PEP students. ESL teachers are, at least to some extent, responsible for teaching PEP students the mainstream curriculum, and mainstream classroom teachers are, in part, responsible for fostering second language development.

Grouping of Students

Abi'ity grouping has received much attention recently. It has come under attack, and in its place cooperative learning — in which small heterogeneous groups work on a task — has gained widespread support. Because PEP students bring a special kind of heterogeneity to the classroom, they need special attention in grouping decisions. Although some ability grouping seems inevitable and may actually be instructionally effective, the psychological drawbacks of segregation and labeling may offset any advantages. Students considered slow or low ability — and PEP students are likely to be misperceived as being in that category because of their limited proficiency in the language of instruction — are in danger of doing little other than practice boring repetitive drills which focus on isolated skills. In addition to stripping the process of learning of its joy and excitement, the tasks that are typically given to low-ability groups are likely to set students up for failure.

The research on grouping dispels the notion that grouping students by ability will help in their academic achievement or that students need to learn with others who are just like them. In cooperative grouping, students of different levels are assigned roles which encourage them to work interdependently on a specific task given by the teacher. Cooperative grouping has been shown to be an effective classroom management technique that promotes learning among heterogeneous groups of students (Slavin, 1981). Cooperative groups are heterogeneous both linguistically and in reading or ability level. Thus, rather than group all PEP students together and have them work under the direction of an instructional aide, PEP students are mixed in with mainstream English proficient students; students who are having difficulty reading the textbook work alongside those who are reading at or above grade level. Because a specific role is assigned to each student, cooperative grouping

is especially beneficial to PEP students: these students can be an integral part of any small group by virtue of the responsibility they are given.

Mainstream classroom teachers not only need to be well versed and feel comfortable with cooperative grouping, but they also need to trust their students to be each other's guides. They have to believe that PEP students, who are "limited" in only one way, are not taking away from other students' learning and advancement. Teachers need to be aware of the fact that the tutoring that goes on in a cooperative group is also quite beneficial to the tutor (Heath, 1990). Teachers' beliefs regarding the potential contribution that PEP students can make in the classroom, as well as other students' attitudes toward PEP students are crucial factors in setting up a successful cooperative learning environment.

The Process of Staff Development

The process of staff development refers to the "how." Staff development programs for the growth of the district, school, or individual are planned, delivered, and evaluated using a variety of strategies and designs. These designs have changed significantly in the last decade, moving away from a traditional format in which teachers receive information given by an "expert." Research on staff development (Joyce and Showers, 1982) has indicated that the presentation of theory alone in inservice programs guarantees that only 5 to 10 percent of the teachers will apply the new skills in their classrooms. If, however, the presentation of content is followed by demonstration, practice, and individual coaching, 90 percent of the teachers apply the new skill.

Staff development has thus moved toward a teacher-centered structure in which teachers collaborate with administrators and with each other to plan staff development, and they coach each other on specific aspects of teaching. Collaboration among teachers, both in the planning phase and in the training phase, provides one of the cornerstones of school restructuring (Joyce, Murphy, Showers, and Murphy, 1989). Among the recommendations arising from school restructuring efforts is a call for allowing teachers to spend more time with their peers both in the classroom and outside the classroom. Unfortunately, most school districts still engage in top-down planning, and while teachers in most districts can get time off for staff development workshops, they cannot get time off to visit a colleague's classroom.

Coaching, in the context of staff development, refers to in-class training by a supportive peer who helps the teacher correctly apply skills learned in a workshop. Coached teachers experience significant positive changes in teaching behaviors, given an appropriate peer coaching staff development program which ensures accountability, support, companionship, and specific feedback over an extended period of time. Coaching is an ongoing process

which involves a training stage followed by various extensions of that training. Extensions include a mutual examination by peer partners of the appropriate use of a new teaching strategy, joint planning of experimental lessons by the two teachers, experimenting in the classroom with the coach observing, the pair of teachers processing the teaching event, and the coach giving specific feedback to the teacher.

Teachers who work with PEP students can benefit greatly from a staff development model which incorporates peer coaching (Kwiat, 1989). On the one hand, ESL and bilingual teachers often experience isolation and alienation from their mainstream classroom peers. On the other hand, mainstream classroom teachers who have PEP students in their classrooms are at a loss as to how to reach those students. They may not have the training they need in order to shelter instruction or to manage a classroom with linguistically heterogeneous groups. A peer coaching program helps bilingual/ESL teachers and mainstream teachers form collegial relationships. Mainstream teachers can most easily learn new knowledge and skills and can learn to apply these strategies to their classroom activities from those peers who are more experienced or more extensively trained in PEP education. By experimenting with specific skills and experiencing success through coaching, mainstream classroom teachers are not only able to improve their teaching in such a way that all students benefit, but they also develop a more positive outlook toward having PEP students in their classrooms (Kwiat, 1989).

An Innovative Approach to Staff Development

Innovative approaches to staff development are being established in school districts where the education of PEP students forms an integral part of the general school program. One of these approaches entails the teaching of a language other than English to any staff members who are interested. The language of choice is usually the native language of the majority of PEP students, and it is offered to teachers, administrators, and support staff, including secretaries, bus drivers, and maintenance personnel. The language course is taught with several main goals in mind. First, participants develop an elementary proficiency in the language: they learn to feel comfortable with the language and they develop a proficiency in the everyday interpersonal communication skills, especially those involving school themes. The content of the course is tailored to individual participants' needs, so that a secretary might learn to use specific aspects of communication that are different from those that a teacher or a principal might learn. Second, participants develop an awareness of what it is like to be nonproficient in a language and are directed to undergo self-examination and reflection. Third, participants are directed to focus on the methods that are being used to teach the language and to reflect on applications to their own students. Finally, in the short time that they spend learning the language, participants develop an awareness of the culture(s) represented. Most

important, the status of at least one of the minority languages present in the school is raised and, indirectly so is the status of other minority languages. In this model, PEP students are seen as a resource rather than a burden to the mainstream classroom teacher, a state that will benefit both student and teacher.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The importance of preparing mainstream classroom teachers to teach PEP students cannot be underestimated. For too long, the education of PEP students has been perceived as the domain of only a small group of specialized individuals, namely ESL and bilingual teachers. This has often led to the isolation of PEP students from the rest of the school and to the provision of a separate curriculum to those students. This isolation and separation of curriculum are not conducive to effective education; it is time to extend a formal invitation to the mainstream to join in the efforts to provide quality education to all students, including those who have the potential to become proficient in English in addition to their native language.

The following recommendations emerge from the issues discussed in this paper. First, mainstream classroom teachers need to become aware of the important role that they play in shaping the lives of PEP students. They need to see themselves as mediators, language models, cultural guides, and advocates of PEP students. They need to explore ways in which they can play these roles in a way that is most comfortable for them and most beneficial to their students. Second, mainstream classroom teachers must be given a more vital role in the daily assessment of PEP students and in the sharing of their specialty with bilingual and ESL teachers. Third, institutions of higher education which prepare teachers can redesign their curricula, albeit slightly, so as to address general issues of the education of students with specialized needs, including those who are potentially English proficient. Fourth, state education agencies, in collaboration with the institutions of higher education, must provide ample opportunities to mainstream classroom teachers who wish to become specialists in the education of PEP students by establishing programs which lead to certification or approval in that field. Fifth, district administrators must offer mainstream classroom teachers a wide array of staff development activities which revolve around the education of PEP students. These can include training in theoretical areas such as second language learning and bilingualism, as well as practical suggestions for sheltering instruction, integrating the teaching of content areas and English as a second language, and grouping students in classroom management. It is recommended that the training be teacher-driven, as is the case with a peer coaching model of staff development.

One of the key elements that contribute to the success of a staff development model such as the one described in the preceding section is the fact that it involves more than just the teachers who come into contact with PEP students in the school. The research on effective schools, the conceptualization of school as a vital community with a distinct culture, and what we know about changing that culture indicate that we can no longer treat teachers as an isolated group of individuals completing a set of isolated tasks in an isolated physical environment. School is a thriving network of arteries that are interconnected and dependent on one another. In order to change the school environment, we need to take a holistic approach to staff development: the provision of services to PEP students is a complex system that consists of various players. Teachers are but one, albeit the most important, of those players. The school principal, support and ancillary staff, bus drivers, and building engineers all form part of the education of students, and they must be included in even the most routine staff development activities.

By preparing mainstream classroom teachers to teach PEP students we will in effect be changing the school culture for the betterment of all students. When teachers are allowed to see bilingualism as a goal to achieve — a solution — rather than a problem to overcome, the school environment becomes an optimal ground for learning, achievement, and success.

REFERENCES

Caldwell, S.D. (1989). Staff development: A handbook of effective practices. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Carter, T.P., & Chatfield, M.L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. America Journal of Education, 95, 200-234.

Chamot, A., & O'Malley, M. (1986). A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum. Rosslyn, VA: NCBE.

Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 617-641.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1989). A concern about... educating limited English proficient students: A CCSSO survey of state education agency activities. Concerns, 26, March, 1-14.

Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J. Alatis (Ed.), Current issues in bilingual education. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Cummins, J. (1986, February). Empowering students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Education Review, pp. 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1980). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. NABE Journal, 4, 25-59.

Damico, J., & Hamayan, E. (1990). Implementing assessment in the real world. In E. Hamayan, & J. Damico. (Eds.), Limiting bias in the assessment of bilingual students. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Davidson, F., Hudson, T., & Lynch, B. (1985). Language testing: Operationalization in classroom measurement and L2 research. In M. Celce-Murcia, (Ed.), Beyond the basics: Issues and research in TESOL. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 9(5), 28-32.

Feuerstein, R. (1982). The dynamic assessment of retarded performers: The learning potential assessment device, theory, instruments, and techniques. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Genesee, F. (1976). The role of intelligence in second language learning. Language Learning,26, 267-280.

Goodlad, J. (Ed.) (1987). The ecology of school renewal: 86th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hamayan, E., & Perlman, R. (1990). Helping language minority students after they exit from ESL/bilingual programs. Washington, D.C.: NCBE.

Heath, S.B. (1990). The senses of being literate. Paper presented at the annual TESOL convention, San Francisco.

Joyce, B. (1990.) Changing school culture through staff development. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B., Murphy, C., Showers, B., & Murphy, J. (1989, November). School renewal as cultural change. Educational Leadership, 70-77.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40, 4-10.

Kreidler, C. (1986, August). ESL teacher certification. ERIC Digest.

Kreidler, C. (1987, November). ESL teacher education. ERIC Digest.

Kwiat, J. (1989). A peer coaching model for teachers of limited English proficient students. Paper presented at the annual AERA convention, San Francisco.

Lambert, W.E. (1977). The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural consequences. In Hornby, (Ed.), Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications. New York, NY: Academic Press.

McMillen, M.M. (1990). Training, certification, and work experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Ogbu, J.U. (1978). Minority education and caste. New York: Academic Press.

O'Malley, J.M. (1983). The 1980-81 teachers language skills survey (Final Report). Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates.

Ovando, C. (1989). Language diversity and education. In J. Banks, & C. M. Banks, (Eds.), Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parker, D. (1985). Sheltered English: Theory to practice. Unpublished' manuscript, California State Department of Education.

Paulston, C.B. (1980). Bilingual education: Theories and issues. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Perlman, R. (1990). A time for change: Restructuring state board policies on the education of elementary and secondary students of limited English proficiency. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Illinois State Board of Education.

Richards, J. & Nunan, D. (1990). Second language teacher education. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthall, R. & Jacobson, L. (1989). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York, NY: Irvington.

Schon, D.A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10, 209-231.

Simich-Dudgeon, C., McCreedy, L., & Schleppegrell, M. (1989). Helping limited English proficient children communicate in the classroom. Silver Spring, MD: NCBE.

Slavin, R.E. (1981). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 38, 655-660.

Sparks, G.M. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 65-72.

Tucker, G.R., Hamayan, E. and Genesee, F. (1976). Affective, cognitive, and social factors in second language
acquisition. Canadian Modern Language Review, 23, 214-226.

Watson, D.L., Northcutt, L. and Rydell, L. (1989, November). Teaching bilingual students successfully. Educational Leadership, 59-61.